

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 49-56 are pending in this application. Claims 49 and 53 are independent. Claims 49 and 53 are hereby amended. Claims 1-48 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at paragraph [0084]. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

The abstract and title are hereby amended.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 49-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,555,023 to Maenaka, et al. in view U.S. Patent No. 5,692,071 to Govaert.

Claim 49 recites, *inter alia*:

“...a correlation detecting means having a band-pass filter
[-1, 0, 2, 0, -1] and a low-pass filter for detecting a

correlation value indicative of a degree of correlation in
each of said at least two directions of said interpolated pixel
data generated by said interpolated pixel data generating
means..." (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Patent No. 5,555,023 to Maenaka, et al. (hereinafter merely "Maenaka") relates to a signal processing circuit that is utilized in a video camera which includes a CCD having pixels arranged in a dot-matrix fashion and color filters of R, G and B arranged in a mosaic fashion, and an output signal from the CCD is converted into a digital signal..

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Patent No. 5,692,071 to Govaert (hereinafter merely "Govaert") relates to finding the stored device independent coordinate triplet which is closest to the device independent target color triplet and then looking up the coordinates in device dependent ABC space about the best fit point.

Applicants submit nothing has been found in Maenaka or Govaert that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 49. Specifically, Applicant submits that Maenaka and Govaert fail to teach or suggest a correlation detecting means having a band-pass filter [-1, 0, 2, 0, -1] and a low-pass filter for detecting a correlation value indicative of a degree of correlation in each of said at least two directions of said interpolated pixel data generated by said interpolated pixel data generating means, as recited in claim 49.

Indeed, while Maenaka describes a correlation value detecting circuit (261), in the first horizontal correlation value detecting circuit 261, the correlation value Sh1 of the specific pixel G22 with respect to the adjacent pixels in the horizontal direction is calculated according to the above described equation (7). More specifically, the correlation value Sh1 is evaluated by performing a calculation of an absolute value of a difference between signals G21 and G23 of the pixels B21 and B23. However, since the pixels B21 and B23 are B pixels, in fact, the signals

G21 and G23 do not exist. Then, the signal G21 is interpolated by the signals G11 and G31, and the signal G23 is interpolated by the signals G13 and G33. (See Maenaka col. 6, lines 46-50).

Applicants submit that the correlation value detecting circuit described in Maenaka does not teach or suggest a band-pass filter [-1, 0, 2, 0, -1] and a low-pass filter for detecting a correlation value indicative of a degree of correlation in each of said at least two directions of said interpolated pixel data, as recited in claim 49.

Therefore, claim 49 is patentable. Claim 53 is also patentable for similar or somewhat similar reasons.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any
overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By


Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800